मांगता है, आप अनुमति देती हैं और फिर वह अपना क्लेरीफिकेशन देता है। जब माननीय राज्यमंत्री श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी यहां पर अपना क्लेरीफिकेशन देने के लिए खड़े हुए तो इस भाव से खड़े हुए थे। उन्हें ऐसा महसूस हुआ होगा कि हमारे प्रतिपक्ष के सम्मानित सदस्यों की भावनाएं शायद मेरे वक्तव्य के कारण आहत हुई हैं और इसीलिए शायद क्लेरीफिकेशन देने के लिए खड़े हुए थे। शायद उनके मन में यह भी बात रही होगी कि जो कुछ मैं कहना चाहता था शायद उस रूप में कुछ सम्मानित सदस्यों के द्वारा उसे नहीं लिया गया। उसी का क्लेरीफिकेशन करने के लिए वह खड़े हुए थे। इसका मतलब यह कि उनकी मंशा यह थी कि हमारे सम्मानित सदस्यों की भावनाएं आहत नहीं होनी चाहिए। क्लेरीफिकेशन कोई व्यक्ति देता है तो इसी कारण से वह अपना क्लेरीफिकेशन देता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चाहे वह मंत्री हो, चाहे सदन का कोई सम्मानित सदस्य हो, यदि उसकी यह मंशा है कि वह इस सदन के किसी भी सम्मानित सदस्य की भावना को आहत नहीं करना चाहता तो फिर उसके बाद उस विषय पर आगे चर्चा करने का या बहस को आगे बढ़ाने का कोई औचित्य मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मैं इतना ही अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा, विनम्र अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा, चूंकि आपकी भी मंशा है और इधर की भी मंशा है कि सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण रहना चाहिए, इसलिए इस सारे मामले को यहीं पर समाप्त कर देना चाहिए क्योंकि सम्मानित मंत्री ने अपना क्लेरीफिकेशन दे दिया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजू परमार : नहीं दिया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री खान गुफ़रान ज़ाहिदी : वह तो आए ही नहीं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कृपाल परमार : मैडम, मेरा रेजोलूशन है।

उपसभापति : ठीक है। प्राइवेट मैम्बर्स रेजोलूशन, श्री कृपाल परमार। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

RE: TOTAL BAN ON RELIGIOUS CONVERSIONS IN THE COUNTRY

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I have a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, what is your point of order?

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, it is regarding the Resolution. Madam, now, I stand not to support or oppose any particular religion in India. We believe in secularism. Now, the Resolution that is going to be moved by the hon. Member, Shri Kripal Parmar, is to urge the Government to bring forward a legislation in the Parliament to ban religious conversions in the country. Madam, this Resolution, basically, I feel, is contrary to the rights conferred upon the citizens of India vide Article 25 of the Indian Constitution. The heading of the Article is "Freedom of Conscience and Free Profession, Practice and Propagation of Religion". Madam, I quote, "Subject to public order, morality and health and to the other provisions of this Part, all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion".

Madam, then Article 14, that is, Equality before Law. Madam, after having said that this Resolution is contrary to Article 25, I quote from Article 14, "The State shall not deny to any person equality before law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India". Therefore, the rights which are actually enshrined under Articles 25 and 14 to the citizens of India, in case this Resolution is moved and passed, it is going to negative these rights. Therefore, the Fundamental Rights will be affected. I feel, that this Resolution...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, he has not even moved the Resolution ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, it is my point of order ...*(Interruptions)*...Madam, this Resolution...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: His objection is ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री कृपाल परमार (हिमाचल प्रदेश) : मैंने अभी यह रेज़ोल्यूशन मूव ही नहीं किया है।

SHRI S.S.AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): Why did you not oppose this legislation in Tamil Nadu Assembly?...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप अपने एन0डी0ए0 पार्टनर को भी दबा रहे हो! ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: We opposed it in the Assembly ...*(Interruptions)*...Madam, I may be allowed to complete my point of order. Madam, after having said this, the Resolution that is going to be moved by the hon. Member is against the Constitutional provision. Therefore, I feel that in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, under Rule 156, "subject to the provisions of these rules, any Member may move a Resolution relating to a matter of general public interest". This is not a general public interest. It is against the general public interest ...*(Interruptions)*...It is against the general public interest. Therefore, I say, when it is against the Constitution, no Resolution or no Bill can be placed or discussed in this august House against this one. Maybe, the only thing is the Chairman has permitted this, you may tell that. But you just inform the Chairman that the House is not permitting this and reconsider this decision taken by the hon. Chairman. Therefore, Madam, we, the DMK Party, totally oppose this Resolution, tooth and nail. We will never accept any Resolution against secularism, which is not going to preserve democracy, unity and integrity of this country. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I just want one clarification. Don't we, every Friday, either have a Resolution or a Bill to amend the Constitution of India? In the same manner, let him move his Resolution. You can reject it...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: For that, I tell you ...*(Interruptions)*...One minute...*(Interruptions)*... one minute...*(Interruptions)*...I agree with you, every Friday there are some Bills or Resolutions seeking amendment to the Constitution. But, this one is to replace the basic structure of the Constitution. Therefore, I oppose this...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): The hon. Member would have been within his rights, if he had framed the Resolution to amend the Constitution. He has made a recommendation for bringing forward a legislation. You are absolutely correct, it can be debated upon; it can be disposed of. But the fact of the matter is if you read the language of the Resolution, the hon. Member says, "That this House resolves that there should be total ban on religious conversions in the country and urges upon the Government to bring forward a legislation in the Parliament for this purpose forthwith." It cannot be an ordinary legislation. It will have to be an amendment of the Constitution. Therefore, to my mind, the language and structure of the Resolution itself is faulty. You are absolutely correct in saying that every day we can bring in a Resolution with a proposal to amend the Constitution. We bring in a large number of Amendment Bills to amend the Constitution. But you must say that you will amend the Constitution. The subject deals with Article 25 of the Constitution. Even on the privy purses--old record could be seen--the Government was directed to bring the Constitutional Amendment on the abolition of the privy purse, in the form of a Resolution. The recommendation was made, if I remember correctly, either in 1969 or in 1970. The Resolution was that the Government was asked to amend the Constitution to bring an appropriate legislation.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Madam, can I make a point of order?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let her answer, and then you can make a point of order. There is no problem.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : उपसभापति महोदय, मूवर आफ द रेजोल्यूशन के बोलने से पहले व्यवस्था के प्रश्न यहां विरुम्मी जी द्वारा और प्रणब दा द्वारा उठाए गए हैं। प्रणब दा तो बहुत वरिष्ठ सांसद हैं और वे इस सदन

के नियमों से पूरी तरह परिचित हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि लैंग्वेज फाल्टी है और विरुम्बी जी ने कहा है कि पब्लिक ऑर्डर को यह खराब करेगा। ये दोनों सवाल एडमिसीबिलिटी आफ रेजोल्यूशन से संबंधित हैं और प्रणब दा यह जानते हैं कि एडमिसीबिलिटी...*(Interruptions)*... Please, let me speak now. You have already spoken...*(Interruptions)*... But why should I yield when I have not even started? I have just spoken a sentence. Please, for God sake...*(Interruptions)*...You have said that this resolution is against the basic structure of the Constitution. That is your objection. And the language is faulty, that is the objection of Pranabda. Now, I am responding to both these things. किसी रेजोल्यूशन की भाषा सही है या फॉल्टी है, इसको तय करने का अधिकार पीठासीन सभापति को है। कोई रेजोल्यूशन बेसिक स्ट्रक्चर को खत्म करता है या नहीं, इसको तय करने का अधिकार सभापति को है। आपको मालूम है कि सभापति जी जिस समय किसी रेजोल्यूशन या किसी मोशन को एडमिट करते हैं तो सारे नियमों और उपनियमों की कसौटी पर उसे तोलते हैं। अगर वह उसे नियमों की परिधि के अंदर पाते हैं तो उसको एलाऊ करते हैं। अगर भाषा में उन्हें किसी तरह की खराबी नज़र आती है तो वे संबंधित व्यक्ति को संशोधन करने के लिए कहते हैं। इसलिए जिस भाषा में, जिस रूप में यह रेजोल्यूशन आज लगा है, वह केवल मेंबर के द्वारा दिए गए रूप में नहीं लगा है। सारे नियमों और उपनियमों की कसौटी पर तोले जाने के बाद, सारी चीजों की फिल्टरेशन के बाद, एडमिशन की सारी कसौटियों को पूरा करने के बाद, सभापति जी के द्वारा तय किया गया रेजोल्यूशन आज यहां लगा है। इसलिए यह कहना कि उसकी लैंग्वेज़ फॉल्टी है - यह प्रश्न मेंबर के बारे में नहीं उठ रहा है, यह प्रश्न सभापति जी की बुद्धिमत्ता पर उठ रहा है। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगी कि एडमिसीबिलिटी का कोई प्रश्न लिस्ट आफ बिजनेस में आने के बाद नहीं उठ सकता। केवल लेजिस्लेशन के इंट्रोडक्शन के समय लैजिस्लेटिव काम्पीटेन्स का प्रश्न उठ सकता है। जो बात प्रणब दा ने कही है, अगर इस रेजोल्यूशन के पारित होने के बाद गवर्नमेंट कोई बिल लाती है और वह बिल गवर्नमेंट की लैजिस्लेटिव काम्पीटेन्स के अधीन नहीं है तो निश्चित ही he is well within his right to raise this objection and say that the Central Government does not have the legislative competence for that. यह केवल प्रस्ताव है, केवल रेजोल्यूशन है और अगर सरकार लेजिस्लेशन लाएगी तो वह भी सारी चीजों को देख-परखकर लाएगी और अगर गलत लाएगी तो सदन को पूरा अधिकार होगा यह कहने का कि यह लैजिस्लेटिव काम्पीटेन्स के अधीन नहीं है। इसलिए यह प्रस्ताव जिस रूप में आया है, सभापति जी ने सारे नियमों को देखकर इसको लगाया है। यह बेवजह की बहस है। इसको समाप्त करते हुए आप मूवर को बुलवाइए और उनसे रेजोल्यूशन मूव करवाइए। पहले भी प्राइवेट मेंबर्स का काफी समय इस पर जा चुका है। आप मूवर को बुलवाइए, ताकि वे इसको मूव करें और इसके ऊपर चर्चा आरंभ हो, इतना ही मुझे निवेदन करना है।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : Madam, I have a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order? ...*(Interruptions)*...What is your point of order, Mr. Vayalar Ravi? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yours is being cleared. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, I have heard what the Minister said. Madam, I had made my observations. What I said was: "It is against the basic structure of the Constitution, it is against the rights conferred by the Constitution." Number two; I requested you to request the hon. Chairman to reconsider the issue. What the Minister said was that it is already accepted by the hon. Chairman. Once a Resolution comes before the House, at the time of the reply, usually, the Minister says, "I will consider this issue." And he withdraws it. If the Minister says, "I will consider", actually it will affect the basic structure of the country. ...*(Interruptions)*...That is why I say...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ: How do you know what the Minister is going to say? How can you assume what he is going to say? ...*(Interruptions)*...How can you presume what the Minister is going to say? Don't presume things...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, this House requests the hon. Chairman to reconsider the acceptance of this Resolution. ...*(Interruptions)*...This House requests the hon. Chairman to reconsider the acceptance of the Resolution.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This House is not saying it; you are saying it...*(Interruptions)*...The entire House is not saying it. Because you have raised the objection, for which the Parliamentary Affairs Minister...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No arguments...*(Interruptions)*...Sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: No Bill, no Resolution should be allowed for discussion if it is against the basic structure of the Constitution. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jothi, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...No, I am not allowing you...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please allow me to speak for a minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not even for a minute. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, I am not allowing you. Please sit down. Let me speak first. I have to settle the matter. The thing is, the Secretary-General has shown me the rules under which this Resolution has been taken, Rules 154, 155, 156 and 157, which give the various conditions for admissibility of a Resolution. According to the Secretariat, its admissibility is correct. Now he has not brought a Constitutional amendment, to which you could say that a Constitutional amendment cannot be against the basic structure of the Constitution. It is only a Resolution which could be rejected by the House, by majority, saying that the Government should not bring such legislation. In any case, I am not pre-empting what the Government is going to say; I do not know what the Government might say at the end. Whatever they may say, still when such a legislation comes before the House, at that point of time, it can be argued that this is against the basic structure of the Constitution. There are many stages at which this Resolution or any legislation can be rejected. But he got it in the ballot and it has been accepted and listed. Let him speak. You also speak; put your viewpoint...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, I have a serious objection. Even the Member himself can amend the Resolution. Instead of saying 'legislation', he can say 'legislation amending the Constitution'. I am not objecting to his raising such Resolution, and I am not objecting that it should not be discussed. What I think is it would have been proper if it had been brought in such a way that the Government could accept it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Virumbi, you have made your argument. Don't waste the time of the House.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Madam, I want to make a submission. It will help you to solve the problem...*(Interruptions)*... It will help you to solve the problem...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Even though it is moved by the Private Member, being a partner of the NDA, I want to make it clear that we are not supporting this Resolution...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. That you can do. While you speak on it, you can do that...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: We, though are in the NDA, are not going to support it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. You have got freedom to either support it or oppose it; it is your right.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Being a part of the NDA, I want to make it clear that even though it is a Private Member's Resolution, it is against the spirit of the national agenda of the NDA.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Accepted. All your objections are part of the record. Now, let us go ahead.

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN (Kerala) : Madam, it is a very important issue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know this. But why can't you put these arguments when it comes for a discussion? ...*(Interruptions)*...I mean, you can't do that now...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: It is affecting the fundamental rights of the people...*(Interruptions)*...This matter has come before the House just now...*(Interruptions)*...We have the right to oppose it even at the time of moving, or before moving it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are you opposing now?

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Madam, this is adversely affecting the fundamental rights of the people of this country...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Madam, I have a submission to make.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After he finishes, I will allow you.

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Madam, this Resolution is totally against the fundamental rights of the people. In our Constitution, Articles 25-28 narrate the fundamental rights. There is no forcible thing here. If something forcible has been done, there should be an action according to the rule of law. That is also here. So, there is no need for any such Resolution. It is totally against the Constitution and it should not be discussed in this House...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think I will allow Shri Jothi now because he is very agitated...*(Interruptions)*... Everybody will speak on the admissibility of it before it is admitted...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Madam, an objection has now been raised and a point of order has been raised on the ground that it was against the basic structure of the Constitution. That is what Shri Virumbi says. I want to tell him as well as the other Members present here that the Constitutional validity of such an Act has been upheld by the Supreme Court, not now, long ago. Thirty years ago, in Madhya Pradesh, an Act of this nature has been passed during the Congress period. The citation of the judgement is Father Stanislas vs. State of Madhya Pradesh. It has been upheld by the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court said that the Act was valid. So, Constitutionally it is not incorrect. Let Shri Virumbi know that first. So, Madam, this can be moved. There is nothing wrong in it...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, here the wordings are "a total ban on conversions". It is a total ban on conversion. It is a very important Resolution. No court has given any judgement on total ban. No court in India has given any judgement on total ban on conversion. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I suggest one thing? ...*(Interruptions)*... Just a minute...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please...*(Interruptions)*...Please...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.S. GNANADESIKAN (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, Shri Jothi has made a wrong statement. The Judgement of the Supreme Court is not on the wordings of this Resolution...*(Interruptions)*... It is on the forcible conversion that a law had been passed by the then Congress Government in Madhya Pradesh...*(Interruptions)*... That was upheld by the Supreme Court and the wordings were "forcible conversion". You cannot have a total ban on conversion...*(Interruptions)*... Shri Jothi's statement is totally wrong. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Both are one and the same...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.S. GNANADESIKAN: Shri Jothi's statement is totally wrong...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I suggest one thing? ...*(Interruptions)*... May I suggest one thing? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please. Will you sit down now? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. Many Private Members' Bills and Resolutions and Government Bills and Resolutions come to this House which you don't agree to; and at the time of discussion you oppose it. Let your opposition become part of the record. Let it be defeated, if you feel so. Let it be decided in a democratic manner. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Virumbi, please. You have taken enough time. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, Mr. Virumbi. I am not allowing...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will be allowed...*(Interruptions)*... You have spoken enough. There are other Members also in the House. Dr. L.M. Singhvi wants to say something...*(Interruptions)*... He has a right to speak...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Madam, may I say something? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know you have been asking me. ...*(Interruptions)*... But he has been asking me before you came. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, the ruling has not been given...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can't give any ruling. ...*(Interruptions)*... My ruling is you discuss and reject it. ...*(Interruptions)*... All right. That is my ruling...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Can we discuss a Resolution which is against the basic structure of the Constitution? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At least, let us discuss it. He has asked the Government. He has not brought a Constitutional amendment. That is what I understand. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI (Rajasthan): Madam, may I say that the points of order raised are entirely out of order? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: I didn't say that it was a Constitutional amendment...*(Interruptions)*... What I said was that it was against the basic structure of the Constitution. That is my stand. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Everything can be discussed. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Nothing can be discussed, if it is against the basic structure of the Constitution...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, will you please sit down? ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : क्या आप डेमोक्रेसी को खत्म करने की अनुमति दे देंगे? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: The point of order is becoming, Madam...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, I have a small request to make. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. I will give you full time. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, I have a small request to make to you. After you finish giving chances to all of them, give me a chance. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think this is an insinuation which you are doing to the Chair. I take great objection to it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: It is very unfortunate. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am taking great objection to it. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am taking great objection to it.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Madam, you may take objection to it. ...*(Interruptions)*... But...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am because I allowed everybody to speak.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL. It is on record that we have been asking it for the last half-an-hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Singhvi sent a chit to me much before anybody asked me.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: He might have sent a chit. But we have been asking ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't argue with me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am not arguing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is very bad. You always do that. It is your habit...*(Interruptions)*...It is not a court. You can argue before a judge, not before the Chair...*(Interruptions)*...Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, what is he saying? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is threatening me. ...*(Interruptions)*... I don't want to ...*(Interruptions)*... I am going to adjourn the House. I am not going to sit here.

(The Secretary-General after consulting the Deputy Chairman clarified that the House had been adjourned by the Deputy Chairman till 11 a.m. on Monday)

The House then adjourned at thirty-eight minutes past three of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 15th December, 2003.

MGIPMRND—4670RS—08-04-2004.